

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/413,110	UNGER, EVAN C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shahnam Sharareh	1617	

All Participants:

(1) Shahnam Sharareh.

(2) Victor Rampkin/Lisa Haile.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 August 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

pending

Claims discussed:

pending

Prior art documents discussed:

Siegel

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner pointed out that incorporation of claims 121, 123, 124, 126 and 128 all together into the generic claims and deletion of the limitations "proteins and polymers" in alternative form in the generic claims can advance the prosecution, because Examiner views the novelty of the instantly claimed invention to lay on the combined use of the claimed ultrasonic frequency causing the cavitation or rupturing of a specific form of vesicle.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "JTA", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.